

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant
FORTINET, INC.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

[illegible]

1 Having considered Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant Fortinet, Inc.'s administrative
2 motion to file under seal portions of Fortinet's Reply in Support of Objections and Motion to
3 Strike New Evidence and New Arguments Presented in Palo Alto Networks, Inc.'s ("PAN")
4 Reply Memoranda in Support of Motions for Summary Judgment ("Reply") pursuant to Civil
5 Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5(c), and good cause appearing:


6 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Fortinet's administrative motion is GRANTED.

7 Accordingly, the following portions of Fortinet's Reply shall be filed under seal:

- 8 a) 2:7-9 (following "admit that . . ." through end of sentence);
9 b) 2:11 (following "including that . . ." through ". . . and that");
10 c) 2:11-12 (following "and that . . ." through ". . . is not");
11 d) 2:14 (following "interconnectivity of . . ." through ". . . Similarly");
12 e) 2:15 (following "'allocation' in . . ." through end of line);
13 f) 2:17-18 (following "reply brief that . . ." through ". . . and that").

14 IT IS SO ORDERED

15
16 Dated: July 19, 2010


17 The Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
18 United States District Court Judge

19 Presented by:

20 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

21 /s/ Stefani E. Shanberg
22 Stefani E. Shanberg

23 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant
24 FORTINET, INC.